

The Southern Standard.

W. D. CHAPMAN
J. R. SMITH
Publishers and Proprietors.

ARTICLE I.—The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.—Federal Constitution.

COLUMBUS:

Saturday Morning, September 11, 1852.

FOR PRESIDENT.

GEN. FRANKLIN PIERCE.

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT.

HON. WILLIAM R. KING.

Democratic Electoral Ticket.

FOR THE STATE AT LARGE.

E. C. WILKINSON.

A. M. JACKSON.

WILLIAM H. JOHNSON.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS.

J. H. R. TAYLOR.

W. S. FEATHERSTON.

O. R. SINGLETON.

HIRAM CASSIDY.

The Southern Standard

Will now be sent to campaign subscribers until the result of the November election is known, for 75 cents. Clubs of 10 sent to the same office shall have it for 50 cents each.

Hon. E. C. Wilkinson & J. L. Alcorn,

Candidates for Electors for the State at large.

Will address the people at the following times and places:

Macon, Noxubee county,	Saturday, Sept. 18
Columbus, Lowndes co.,	Monday, " 20
Starkville, Oktobeha co.,	Tuesday, " 21
Houston, Chickasaw co.,	Saturday, " 25
Greensboro' Choctaw co.,	Tuesday, " 28
Middleton, Carroll co.,	Wednesday, " 29
Shongalo, " "	Thursday, " 30
Kosciusko, Attala county,	Saturday, Oct. 2
Richland, Holmes county,	Monday, " 4

The reader will find the card of Mons. Stuart, a teacher of DANCING, in another column. It will be seen, that Mons. Stuart presents the names of gentlemen of character as to his qualifications. He will give his first lesson to gentlemen on Monday next.

The rumor of A. H. Stephens, of Ga., having come out for Scott, is without truth. He spoke at Atlanta, on the 2nd inst., and among other things, he said that "Scott ought to be defeated." We will give in our next issue copious extracts from his speech—he knocks Scott's Dan Adams' speech out of water.

The corporation of Columbus has, by a vote of 233 to 7, determined to raise a tax of \$50,000, to be appropriated towards building a branch from this city to the main trunk of the M. and O. Railroad—a tax of \$10,000 annually to be assessed for five years on the property within the corporation.

Webster's position defined.

We are impressed with the conviction that Daniel Webster is opposed to the election of Gen. Scott to the Presidency. The Springfield (Mass.) Republican, a Scott paper, says, that Mr. Banks, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, has just returned from Washington, and says that he (Banks) was told by Mr. Webster, that he should prefer to see the Electoral vote of Massachusetts given to Gen. Pierce, rather than to Gen. Scott. The Republican says, that Mr. Banks says this, there can be no doubt—"we have," says the Republican, "accumulative public and private testimony to this fact." "The conclusion is," continues the Republican, "that Mr. Banks either tells a falsehood, or Mr. Webster prefers Gen. Pierce's election to that of Gen. Scott."

We give entire credit to the above, for we find much in our Northern exchanges to confirm it.

Col. J. B. Cobb.

We have received a note from this gentleman, requesting us to erase his name from our list as a subscriber to the Standard. We are surprised to learn that we had offended the Colonel, and we are not apprised by his note, for he has failed to point us to what he construed as offensive to him, in his note. If the Colonel had been more distinct in his note, and directed our attention to the expression or expressions to which he objects, we would have afforded us an opportunity of making the *amende honorable*, which, whatever he may privately think, our general kind feeling for him as a man would have prompted, aside from the courtesy we hold due to him as an opponent. But his note is vague and general, and we are to conclude from its general tenor, that we "have provoked his pity." Merciful heavens!

The Colonel lectures us a little about "editorial courtesy." We yield, without a word, to his superior judgment, refined taste, and profound literary acquirements, experience and fame; and acknowledge, since he so pronounces, that we are "liberal, ill-natured, and coarse," and may have "transgressed all the limits of editorial courtesy and gentlemanly demeanor." We plead guilty to all this, but hold that our ignorance of the refined and elevated standard erected by the Colonel should have shielded us for his "pity."

One other word. Intentionally, we have never intended to wound the feelings of Col. Cobb; our regard for him as a man would have shielded him from such an assault. Had our disposition been otherwise, we would have known it, for no man in the State of Mississippi is more legitimately the subject for criticism or ridicule, than he is. He is an author, and is, therefore, a standing subject for the editor's pen. He is a very poor politician, and is, therefore, a standing subject for political squabbles. Whenever we feel inclined to change our course towards Col. Cobb, he nor his friends will misunderstand us—if we should ever entertain towards him "pitiful" feelings, as he elegantly terms it, he will discover, that under the disguise of petty flings, we attack no man. Such a course is pursued along by the coward and assassin.

While Col. Cobb may think that "this disconcerting the Standard" is drawing from us amends for personal injury or wrong to himself, we beg to say, that in our poor judgment, it is a new way to resent injustice, and quite unbecomingly our friend, for we shall claim him as such socially, though he don't read our paper.

It was necessary for Seward and his friends to choose between Webster and Fillmore and Scott—Argus.

According to this, Seward and his friends dictated to the convention its candidate. Just what we said all the time. How could it be otherwise, when Mr. Fillmore went into the convention with the vote of Fourteen Southern States almost unanimous for him, that he should be defeated except by Sectional influence?

The Argus says that the compromise measures "engendered personal animosities, mutual, relentless and permanent." Its a fact—the case is chronic, and the Seward men have thrown forward Gen. Scott as a sacrifice, we presume.

The Philosophy of the Columbus Argus.

The Argus of this city has attempted an explanation of the causes which induced the Seward wing of the Northern whig party to support Gen. Scott, and to oppose Fillmore and Webster in the convention. It may be proper to say, that the History presented by the Argus is not more defective in facts, than its conclusions are erroneous. It asks this question:—

"Who brought him (Gen. Scott) forward then?" and it answers this question thus:

"Not Seward, but the National Whigs—those who embodied all that was sound and conservative amongst the Northern people."

This is strong language, and never should have been used, without the clearest evidence to sustain it. If it is susceptible of proof, we are unapprised of the existence of any record to sustain it; and we take the liberty of saying that we read the newspapers of the day, and do pretend to some information in regard to this matter. We think the Argus is mistaken in saying that those whigs who brought Scott forward "embodied all that was sound and conservative amongst the Northern people." And now to the proof.

Gen. Scott owes his nomination to Ohio, N. York, and Pennsylvania. The Finality of the Compromise Acts, has been regarded, both North and South, as a Test of Nationality, and the National Whig convention as regarding it, embraced that in its platform as a part of its National creed. This, the Argus will not deny. Being a Test, it is well to know, whether the three States, to which Scott owes his nomination, approved of those Measures, and agreed in State convention, to abide by and adhere to them, as a Finality. It is our impression, that the Argus will not pretend to say, that either of these States approved of those Measures, or that the party bringing Scott "forward" in them, regard those Measures as a Finality.

It is proper to say, that we remember but one Northern State that pretended to approve of those Measures. Ohio voted down, we believe, a resolution of approval, by an overwhelming majority, and yet Scott was nominated by that convention. The history of the efforts of the friends of those Measures in Pennsylvania, are too well known to be recapitulated here; Gov. Johnson and Thad. Stevens were triumphant, and Scott got the nomination. [The reader will see in another column a few remarks made by Stevens in the House the other day.]

We now come to New York, and in this State we shall see a strong demonstration of the "sound conservative" feeling "embodied" for Scott, of which the Argus speaks. One remark before we introduce the proof. We say distinctly, and we challenge the Argus to deny it, that Mr. Fillmore was, from first to last, the "embodiment of sound conservative" views as squared by the Test embraced in the resolutions of the National whig convention. He was, in other and more explicit phrase, the candidate, both North and South, (with but a slight exception) of those men who were National in having declared that the Compromise Measures were a "final settlement in principle and substance of the subjects to which they relate." The following article is from the Buffalo, N. Y. Express, a Scott Whig paper, published at the home of Mr. Fillmore.

"THE WHIG CAUCUS.—The members of Congress met in the Senate Chamber on the 9th inst. The proceedings are far from presenting a gratifying prospect for the success of the Whig party. It would seem that the parties who got into power in the Whig party, by accident, are determined that the party shall continue them in power, or be defeated; and in their efforts to produce that result, are seeking to place the Whig party upon a platform that will insure its ignominious defeat, or may be nominated. This scheme is urged for the sake of Mr. Fillmore—and his only; and if it shall succeed, as it is not by any means impossible, the Whig party will long have occasion to regret the misplaced confidence, by which he has been advanced to a position which enabled him to produce such unfortunate results. It is plain enough, that no principles or measures ought to be made a part of the Whig platform, in regard to which Whigs entertained adverse opinions. To introduce them, is to introduce discord and defeat. The democracy introduced such a plank into its platform, and were thereby divided and defeated. If the Whig party commit the same folly, it will be punished by a like defeat."

"If we look into the proceedings of the Congressional Whig caucus, lately held at Washington, we shall discover the principle which is to be vindicated by the nomination of Mr. Fillmore, and 'nobody else'—the principle in support of which Mr. Marshall pretends that the Whigs of Kentucky would 'prefer defeat, rather than win success by its abandonment.' At the Congressional caucus, which was held for the purpose of fixing upon a time and place for holding a National Convention, 'Mr. Marshall, of Kentucky, said that before the time and place were fixed for holding the Convention, he desired that they should understand each other, and he would therefore move the adoption of the compromise resolutions passed last December by the Whig caucus.'"

"Those resolutions were drawn to pledge the Whig party to the compromise measures, as a finality; they were offered on that occasion by Mr. Haven from this country, whom it will not be doubted, acted upon an understanding with Mr. Fillmore, and in strict accordance with his views.—This is conclusive evidence that Mr. Marshall in his present action, represents exactly and with fidelity the views of Mr. Fillmore. From all this it pretty clearly appears, that the principle sought to be established by the nomination of Mr. Fillmore, is the finality of the compromise, fugitive slave law and all. It is, it seems, to be made a part of the Whig creed, that the compromise measures, including the law for catching men and conveying them into slavery, are Whig measures, and that the Whig party will not hereafter permit them to be altered, amended, or repealed."

"It will strike the reader as not a little remarkable, that Mr. Marshall and the other conformists of Mr. Fillmore, should have attempted to make Mr. F. strong in New York, by placing him before the Whigs of this State with such a creed and platform. Are they so very verdant as not to know, that because Mr. Fillmore was the potential instrument of passing the compromise, that two successive Whig State Conventions, and two successive Whig Legislatures have refused to utter one word of endorsement of him or his administration, though much importuned from Washington to do so—and lastly, that by a vote of sixty to one, a Whig legislative caucus suggested General Scott as their first choice for the Presidency? When such clear manifestations of Whig opinion are before them, can they suppose for a moment that a man who makes the 'compromise a finality' his test, can receive any considerable countenance in this State? If the convention should adopt that sectional test and nominate Mr. Fillmore, all the best exertions of all the press and politicians in the State could not poll sixty-six per cent. of the Whig vote for our ticket. Nor do we believe that there is a single free State that the Whigs could carry on this issue."

This is proof conclusive that the Argus errs in saying that the men who brought Scott forward at the North, "embodied all that was sound and conservative amongst the Northern people." Another point is this: Mr. Fillmore had in the convention seven delegates from New York only, and it is clear that he either did not represent the "sound and conservative" opinions of the people of that State, or else the people of that State were misrepresented in the two State conventions of

which the Express speaks, as well as in the legislature. Another point. The resolutions passed by the whig National convention in which the compromise measures are announced as a Finality, New York voted 23 against to 11 for them. Ohio 15 against 8 for them. This shows a "sound conservative" feeling.

We will now introduce an original friend to the nomination of Scott as a witness; it is from the correspondent of the N. Y. Tribune, writing from Washington city:

"The administration of General Taylor adopted the let-alone policy. It proposed to have nothing to do with the subject of slavery. It said: 'Leave the fugitive law alone, leave California and New Mexico to come in as States when they get ready, and leave them to settle for themselves all questions of slavery arising within their own boundaries.' This was the policy of the Whig administration of General Taylor on the slavery question."

"Under Mr. Fillmore the policy was changed. The present Administration insists that the line of action of the Whig party on this subject shall be what it never was before, viz: a perfect agreement and concurrence of opinion, and action upon it, by both divisions or sections of the party. While it is a fact that the two wings never did agree before on the question of slavery, it is proposed now they shall agree. A course of policy for the whole party is thus laid down on the slavery question. Certain measures have been passed by Congress. Chief among them is the fugitive slave law, and the law establishing territorial governments without restriction as to slavery. The doctrine is that the Northern Whigs, as well as the Southern Whigs, shall sustain those laws just as they are. And not this only: they shall also agree and declare that the slavery question is finally adjusted; that there is to be no more talk, no more action, on the subject. Slavery is henceforth to be a taboed question in the party. It is the 'Pot Rock' in our political navigation, to which our Whig Administration profess to have been the Mons. Malle-lef, blowing off all its dangerous prominence. It is to be hereafter considered sunk."

"This is the present position of the Whig Administration on this subject—a subject that has long divided it, and long been regarded as a question on which the two divisions of the party were to be allowed to differ—upon which in the very nature of things, they could in fact do no otherwise than differ."

We close our extracts by introducing a very significant paragraph from a speech delivered in the Senate by Mr. Mangum:

"We must introduce into our platform and our creed a new principle. We are to take the compromise as a new article in our political creed. I have not looked at it very much of late; but I will remember, when it was passed, if you went South, you would find but a mere majority of Whigs and Democrats, combined, in favor of it; and if you went North, you would find the majority the other way—more Democrats in favor of it than Whigs, I admit. Well, that would be a platform."

The Argus says, that "The support of Seward and friends, is recent and accidental." The Argus is mistaken. It can be shown by the record that Seward and many of his friends were Scott's advocates as far back as 1840, and that since the passage of the compromise measures, Seward through those who act with him, have shaped public opinion towards Scott, while they have been unsparing in their denunciation of Mr. Fillmore and the Fugitive Slave Law. We have an abundance of proof on this point, but we are disinclined to open a matter wholly profitless in this canvass either to Gen. Scott or Gen. Pierce.

A Scott Gun Spiked.

The Scott press have paraded a vote cast by Gen. Pierce against a bill allowing one Edmund Brooke, of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, to bring into the District two slaves from the State of Virginia.—In our opinion, Pierce never gave a vote more worthy of Southern praise than this. If Congress has the legal right to admit slaves within the District by law, will it not follow that it has the right to send them out of the District by law. It occurs to us, that this is the very argument employed by the Scott whigs in regard to the Territories. But let that pass for what it is worth. Georgetown is in that part of the District of Columbia ceded by Maryland. In 1796 the State of Maryland passed a law in these words:

"That it shall not be lawful, from and after the passage of this act, to import or bring into this State, by land or water, any negro, mulatto, or other slave, for sale, OR TO RESIDE WITHIN THIS STATE; and any person brought to this State as a slave, contrary to this act, if a slave before, shall thereupon immediately cease to be the property of the person or persons so importing or bringing such slave within this State, and shall be free."

On the 27th of Feb., 1801, Congress passed a law, the first section of which is as follows:

"That the laws of the State of Virginia, as they now exist, shall be and continue in force in that part of the said District, which was ceded by that State to the United States, and by them accepted as aforesaid."

This law can be found in the U. S. Statutes at large, vol. 2, page 103—a copy of which can be seen by our proof demanding Scott men, at the office of almost any lawyer in our city.

Every Union whig must remember the ground upon which the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was defended in this State last summer. First, it was to prevent the increase of slaves within the District, and in the second place, it was but simply the re-enactment of the Maryland law. It will be perceived by the bill for the relief of Brooke, which we give below, that no application was made to repeal the Maryland law; it was a demand for a "special privilege" in favor of Brooke; to permit him to do that which was denied by law, for any other man to do. Gen. Pierce was disinclined to grant a right to Brooke that was denied to other citizens of the District; that was not all; he was not disposed to set aside, by a law of Congress, a law enacted by the people of the State of Maryland for their own protection.

Here is what Mr. Brooke asked—[See U. S. statutes at large, vol. 6, p. 600.]

"That Edmund Brooke, of Georgetown, in the district of Columbia, be authorized, and permission is hereby granted him, to bring from the State of Virginia, into the said District of Columbia, two negro slaves, namely, John and Alfred, the property of the said Brooke; and to have and to exercise the same rights of property, and of ownership, over the said slaves, as if he had been brought by the said Brooke into said District at the time of his removal to the said District of Columbia, any law, usage or custom to the contrary notwithstanding."

Scott and the Nomination.

Gen. Scott in his letter accepting the nomination of the convention, says:

"Not having WRITTEN A WORD to procure this distinction, I lost not a moment, after it had been conferred, in addressing a letter to one of your members to signify what would be, at the proper time, the substance of my reply to the convention; and I now have the honor to repeat, in a more formal manner, as the occasion justly demands, that I accept the nomination, with the resolutions annexed."

Here he tells the country distinctly, that he had not written a word to procure the nomination. Well, it may be so. But there are those who may question this statement, though we shall not. Here is another letter written before the nomination, and which was "smoked out" of Botts' pocket by Choate, of Mass.:

MY DEAR SIR: I have decided to write nothing to the convention, or to any individual member, before nomination; but should that honor fall to my lot, I shall, in my acceptance, give my views on the compromise measures in terms at least as strong in their favor, as those I read to you two days since. Please say as much to my friends Governor Jones, Mr. Botts, Mr. Lee, &c.

In haste, truly yours,
WINFIELD SCOTT.

To Hon. W. S. ARCHER.

Now this is an extraordinary document truly. He says he has decided to write nothing to the convention, yet writes to Archer, and requests him to show the letter to Jones, Botts and Lee. He says in this letter that if he should be nominated, that he will give his views on the compromise measures in terms as strong in their favor as those he had READ to Archer two days before. What did he read to Archer? Where is that document? What did he read to Archer? Why did he instruct Archer to show that letter to Jones and Botts? He knew they were talking men; they could learn from Archer in what "terms" he would express himself in "favor of the compromise measures," and by this adroit shift, he felt secure of getting the nomination without committing his views on the compromise measures to writing, a thing which he begged his personal friends not to insist upon. Was such trickery as this ever practiced before to secure a nomination for the Presidency in this country?

The editor of the N. Y. Courier & Enquirer, one of the most thorough whigs in the Union, says:

"The nomination of Gen. Scott was accomplished by a DISHONEST AND DISGRACEFUL BARGAIN—AS CORRUPT A BARGAIN AS WAS EVER PLACED ON PAPER."

"But circumstances speak in language which admits of no misapprehension; and the subsequent conduct of a portion of the delegations from Tennessee, Kentucky and Virginia, leaves no doubt but that Mr. Raymond, for the purpose of apologizing for the Whigs of the North acceding to a National platform, foolishly and weakly exposed the BARGAIN AND CORRUPTION."

A Short chapter in the History of New Hampshire.

In 1846 the Whigs and Abolitionists combined in the legislature of New Hampshire, and districted the State. They threw, by a most unheard of system of gouging and cutting up of towns, a democratic majority of about five or six thousand, into two districts, the 2nd and 4th. Tuck, an Abolition Whig, was elected from the 1st, and Jas. Wilson, Whig, from the 3rd district. This identical coalition elected Jno. P. Hale to the U. S. Senate. Yes, says the Whigs, the democracy of New Hampshire is "unanimously abolition."

Another Short Chapter.

Thad. Stevens, that "sound and conservative" supporter of Gen. Scott, moved to lay the Fugitive Slave bill upon the table, and demanded the yeas and nays. Hibbard and Peaslee, the two democrats from New Hampshire, vote NAY—Amos Tuck, the New Hampshire abolition Whig, voted, YEA! "Unanimously abolition!"

On the motion, ordering the bill to a third reading, Hibbard and Peaslee, democrats from N. Hampshire, voted, YEA! Amos Tuck, the abolition whig from N. Hampshire, voted NAY! "Unanimously abolition." On the question, "Shall this bill pass"—the yeas and nays being demanded—Hibbard and Peaslee, N. Hampshire democrats, voted YES! Amos Tuck, the New Hampshire abolition whig, voted NO! "Unanimously abolition!"—See Con. Globe, vol. 21, 2nd part, pp. 1806-7.

Wilson, the other whig from N. H., had resigned his seat a few days before the Fugitive slave law passed, or he would have voted with Tuck. An election was held in Wilson's district; Jared Perkins, an "unanimous abolition whig" was opposed by Gen. Morrison; Morrison obtained the certificate of election, and took his seat. Jared appeared before Congress, through Amos Tuck; Josh Giddings, and Thad. Stevens, and contested the seat. The committee on elections reported in favor of Morrison, and the House sustained the committee against all the abolitionists.

"Gen. Scott owns slaves, though it is not generally known."—Argus.

The Argus insists that this statement is true.—Let us admit it for the sake of argument, and see in what position it places Gen. Scott. In his letter to Atkinson, he says, and we quote the whole paragraph:

"I own myself no slaves; but never have attached blame to masters for not liberating their slaves—well knowing that liberation, without the means of sending them in comfort to some position favorable to the pursuit of happiness, would, in most cases, be highly injurious to all around, as well as to the man himself. I am persuaded, however, that the operation was general and under the auspices of prudent legislation. But I am persuaded that it is a high moral obligation of masters and slave-holding States to employ all means, not incompatible with the safety of both colors, to meliorate slavery, even to extermination."

He here says he has never attached blame to masters for not liberating their slaves, but he is "persuaded that it is a high moral obligation of masters to employ all means, not incompatible with the safety of both colors, to meliorate slavery, even to extermination." It is a high moral obligation, is it? Well, does Gen. Scott square his own conduct by what he is "persuaded is a high moral obligation" for masters to employ all means, not incompatible with the safety of both colors, to exterminate slavery, Gen. Scott occupies a singular position before the country, in living in open violation of what he pronounces a high moral obligation resting on masters, if he holds slaves. The Argus will not pretend to say that Scott is unable to liberate his slaves, and "send them in comfort to some position favorable to the pursuit of happiness." He is drawing six or more thousand Dollars from the Treasury of the U. S. States, annually; and can spare a few hundred of this sum for the purpose of sending his slaves to Liberia, or to the Western Territories.

There is much room for very severe comment in regard to this matter; if the statement of the Argus be true, and we have no reason to believe it otherwise.

Will the Argus be so kind as to inform its readers on what authority it says that Pierce's sustained by Atwood and Chase for the Presidency. It surely must have some authority for the statement.

"Sound and Conservative."

We are meeting in our exchanges daily with the expression of what some may regard as "Sound and Conservative" views. If it was the sound and conservative portion of the Northern people who brought Scott forward, it follows that the reasons which they assign for his support, are sound and conservative. The editor of the Pittsburg, Pa., Gazette, an ardent supporter of Gen. Scott, Gov. Johnson, et id &c., says in a late number of his paper:

Let us be understood. Between us and our Free Soil friends there is no dispute as to the character of slavery as it exists in the United States. The only difference between us is, how shall it be dealt with?

Now, we charge upon our free soil friends that they have left the post of danger and of efficient service. Whom do the champions of slavery most fear, and at whom do they aim their heaviest blows? Are they directed against Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Gerrit Smith, or even at John P. Hale or Joshua R. Giddings? By no means; for so long as these gentlemen occupy the positions they do, they strengthen slavery by thwarting and baffling the efforts of the men who are laboring to arrest its progress and resist its claims. Weakened by their desertion, the friends of freedom in the North have been forced to give way somewhat. Well may the defenders of slavery look with complacency at such movements as the nomination of Hale, and the Conventions of Buffalo and Pittsburg, while they aim their heaviest blows at such men as Seward, Johnston and Greeley. These latter have not removed beyond striking distance, as have the others we have named."

For these reasons we conceive it to be our duty to remain where we are—in the Union—in the Whig party; and to direct our efforts to deliver both, if possible from the dominion and curse of slavery; for if Slavery is ever to be abolished peacefully, we are in the right position to make our influence and efforts felt to that effect.

To support Scott then, is to deliver the whig party of the dominion and curse of slavery, and to abolish it if it ever is peacefully abolished. This is "sound and conservative," is it?

"If the Standard correctly informs us, there were only two whigs in the Senate of New Hampshire at the last session of its Legislature—these two he does not however, take the pains to inform his readers, voted against a resolution to approve the votes of the Congressmen from New Hampshire in favor of the Wilmot proviso, nor does he tell them that all the Whigs in that Legislature voted against that Resolution, and every Democrat in favor of it."—Argus.

That is true. We have not taken pains to tell our readers that the two whigs in the Senate of New Hampshire at the last session, "voted against a resolution to approve the votes of the Congressmen from New Hampshire in favor of the Wilmot proviso"—nor have we taken the pains to tell them that "all the whigs in that legislature voted against that resolution, and every democrat in favor of it." Our reason for not having told them is, that we do not think it true—we do not think any such resolution was offered at the last session of the New Hampshire legislature. Let us have the proof.

We did tell them, however, that the Legislature of New Hampshire, at its last session, passed resolutions, approving the Compromise Measures, and pledging the State, to aid the Executive in carrying them into full effect. These resolutions were adopted in the Senate by a vote of Ten to Two—Every Democrat voting for them, and the Only Two Whigs in that body, Voting Against, them. In the House, these resolutions were passed by a vote of 152 to 92. Of those who voted for them, 122 were Democrats, and 30 whigs—of those who voted against them, six were Democrats. In the Senate and House, 132 Democrats voted for, and six against them. Of the Whigs, 30 voted for, and Eighty Eight against them!

Here is one of the resolutions:

"Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives in general court convened, That the State of New Hampshire APPROVES of the adoption of these measures (the compromise measures) as essential and necessary for the peace, prosperity, and progress of our glorious Union, and that we pledge her to sustain the Executive of the nation in carrying said measures into full effect, and in the further execution of all constitutional means to enforce obedience to the laws."

Our neighbor of the Argus says: that unless we furnish the proof, as we have charged, that Gen. Scott requested his personal friends not to call on him to give publicity to his opinions on the Compromise Measures, or give good reasons for refusing, that it will "brand the charge as false and its proponent as unworthy of belief." Now that would be terrible. We are of the opinion that our neighbor would prefer the proof rather than unkind words, and we say to him therefore in perfect good humor, that if he will send a friend, or come himself to our office, and we prefer the latter as being the more sociable way, we will furnish him the proof if he will publish it. To this he cannot object, if he wishes the proof only.

By the way, neighbor, we intend to transgress no rule of editorial courtesy, if we know it; but this branding our statements as untrue, because we refuse to prove them at the call of those to whom the remarks were not addressed, is a course not in keeping with the rules of the most common social intercourse. When we make an assertion in any controversy with our neighbor, that he considers requires substantiating, and he calls for the proof, we are bound to furnish it in good faith. Are we right, neighbor, in this, or wrong? We ask an answer.

We feel assured that the Argus will not care to make many demands for proof from the Standard. In making a statement we are always prepared with the proof.

The Argus says that no reasonable man would search the votes given in the last Presidential election to find the number of Abolitionists in N. Hampshire or any other State. Well, what then? "He would," says the Argus, "examine the records of its legislature—he would look to the sentiments of the men elected by that legislature, to judge of its Abolitionism if he would judge correctly." Would he. Let us apply this rule. At the last session of the N. Hampshire legislature, resolutions were passed, approving of the Compromise Measures, and pledging the State to sustain the President in carrying them into effect—the Fugitive Slave law included. In the Senate and House 132 Democrats voted for the resolutions, and only 6 against them. Of the Whigs, 30 voted for the resolutions, and 88 against them. What says the Argus to this, as a reasonable man?

The whole vote given by New Hampshire in 1847 was not 50,104, if the Standard does so assert, but was 43,300—some difference.—Argus.

The Standard has made no such assertion—it has not even alluded to the 1847 vote of N. Hampshire.—We used the vote of 1848, and that, according to five tables we have, was 50,104.

The Argus is distressed because the New Hampshire legislature passed Wilmot proviso resolutions in 1846-7. It is a very distressing occurrence no doubt. N. Jersey, the home of Gen. Scott, did the very same thing. This is distressing too—but it is awful to relate, that not only did these two States do so, but every free State in the Union, Iowa alone excepted.

In a recent speech, the Hon. Tom. F. Marshall remarked: "They tell me that Mr. Pierce was a member of Congress when I was; it may be, but if he was, I never knew it.—Natchez Courier."

Tom Marshall is as celebrated for his love of drink as he is for the sharpness of his wit. Tom was sent to Washington by the whigs, but he forgot to which party he owed his seat in Congress, and he gave the whigs "fits" in a most crushing and virulent speech. From that hour till last summer, Tom, believed himself a democrat, but he got sober one day—by accident—and swore he was a whig. Its not likely that Tom Marshall and Frank Pierce drank at the same grocery, and that accounts for Tom's not knowing him.

Our neighbor started out by saying that there are Ten States that give a larger abolition vote than New Hampshire.—Argus.

Well, to this, you said:

"There may be ten larger Abolition States than N. Hampshire, but there is no State that polls more abolition votes according to the population."—Argus.

To this we replied by proving that there were Four States casting a larger abolition vote than New Hampshire, according to population. Our first assertion is unimpeached. Where is that of the Argus, based on Population?

If the democracy of N. H., are not abolitionists, why have they so long suffered Hale, the embodiment of abolitionism, to represent them? Will the Standard answer that?—Argus.

Certainly! J. P. Hale was elected to the U. S. Senate by the vote of the Whigs and abolitionists.—So was W. H. Seward, of N. York, and B. F. Wade of Ohio.

We presume our neighbor of the Argus has seen in his Georgia exchanges, some account of Alex. H. Stephens' speech at Atlanta, on the 2nd inst.

For the Southern Standard.

MR. EDITOR:—We have no sympathy with the free-soilers of the North or their assuming adherents and apologists of the South. We deem them both dangerous to Southern institutions, and believe it our duty to rebuke their wild and incendiary principles. It matters not, that such principles are advocated by certain infected individuals of the South; the question is, whether or not the principles themselves are abstractly correct and salutary in their practical operation. If they are wrong in principle and fraught with destruction to the interests of the South, the advocacy of them by such prints as the Columbus Argus, cannot intrinsically belong to them. And when the Argus presumes to think that the people of this State, will so far forget the obligations they owe "to their own, their native land"—as to follow him in his endorsement of